

ISSN 1343-8980

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成27年度
(第19号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2015

Volume XIX

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2016・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo · 2016

The Arrangement of the Rules in the Theravāda

Bhikkhunīpātimokkha

Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ

Abstract

The *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* of the *Vinaya* of the Theravādins contains only the rules unique to nuns (*bhikkhunīs*), and, in addition, a statement regarding the total number of rules valid for them. It does not include the rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* which are common (*sādharaṇa*) to both, monks (*bhikkhus*) and nuns (*bhikkhunīs*). From the *Vinaya* itself it is neither clear which of the bhikkhus' rules are shared and which unshared (*asādharaṇa*), nor in which sequence the rules unique to bhikkhunīs and those common to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs are to be grouped together in a complete *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha*. The *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* sections of the commentaries on *Vinaya* and *Pātimokkha*, that is the *Samantapāsādikā* and *Kaṅkhāvitaranī*, comment solely on the rules unique to bhikkhunīs. But both contain information as to which rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* are common to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs, and both include guidelines for grouping the rules. Thereby these two commentaries differ with respect to the complete set of Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules for bhikkhunīs. The sequence proposed in the *Samantapāsādikā* – the better one from the point of view of content – also is more consistent with the sequence of rules parallel to the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya section in other Buddhist schools' *Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣas*. The sequence in the *Kaṅkhāvitaranī*, on the other hand, goes along with the arrangements of the Saṅghādisesa and Pācittiya rules in the (received) Theravāda tradition and is the one found in all complete *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha* editions.

Keywords

Bhikkhunīpātimokkha, *Kaṅkhāvitaranī*, *Samantapāsādikā*, Nissaggiya-Pācittiya, sequence of rules

1. Arrangement of the rules in the *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha* according to the *Vinayapiṭaka*

The Buddhist nuns' *Pātimokkha* (henceforth BhnPāt) is classified in the same way as the Buddhist monks' *Pātimokkha* (henceforth BhPāt) with one difference: the BhnPāt does not have a section on "undetermined [rules]" (*aniyata*). Thus it consists of seven sections only, namely (1) Parajika, (2) Saṅghādisesa, (3) Nissaggiya-Pācittiya, (4) [Suddha-]Pācittiya, (5) Pāṭidesaniya, (6) Sekhiya rules and (7) Adhikaraṇas. Sections six and seven are identical with the respective sections in the BhPāt. Section five of the BhnPāt contains only rules exclusively laid down for bhikkhunīs. But for sections one to four of the complete BhnPāt, rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* which are also valid for bhikkhunīs, that is the so-called

shared (*sādharaṇa*¹) rules, have to be taken into account too. In the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* of the *Vinayapiṭaka* (henceforth Vin), however, only the rules unique to bhikkhunīs are transmitted; the shared rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* are not repeated. Thus the *Vinayapiṭaka* does not contain a complete *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha* presenting all rules relevant for bhikkhunīs. However, it includes statements regarding the total number of rules valid for bhikkhunīs for each class of offences,² given once at the beginning of each class (except in the Pārājika section³) and once at the end (Table 1). Whereas the references in the beginning, similarly to headings and sub-headings, most likely have been added secondarily during the transmission process,⁴ those in the end have a higher probability of originally belonging to the text, since they are placed at the beginning of the concluding sections of the various classes of offences and are commented upon in the commentary on the *Vinaya*, the *Samantapāśadikā* (henceforth Sp),⁵ and the commentary on the *Pātimokkha*, the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* (henceforth Kkh).⁶

Class of offences	Number of rules unique to bhikkhunīs	Total number of rules for bhikkhunīs	Source for the total numbers
Pārājika	4	8	Vin IV 222,9
Saṅghādisesa	10	17	Vin IV 223,1f. and 242,12
Nissaggiya-Pācittiya	12	30	Vin IV 243,1 and 257,5
Pācittiya	96	166	Vin IV 258,1f. and 345,24
Pāṭidesaniya	8	8	Vin IV 346,1f. and 348,16

Table 1: References from the *Vinaya* for the total number of bhikkhunī rules

Thus the number of rules to be taken over from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* can be gathered by comparing the total number of bhikkhunīs' rules and the number of rules unique to bhikkhunīs (Table 2).

1. The terms “shared” (*sādharaṇa*) and “unshared” (*asādharaṇa*) come up for the first time in the *Vinītavatthu* section of Pārājika 1 M, in connection with the sex change of bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs (Vin III 35,16.22). The *Vinītavatthu* belongs to the youngest parts of the *Suttavibhaṅga*. The terms, furthermore, appear in the *Cullavagga* in connection with the ordination of Mahāpajāpatī Gotamī (Vin II 258,16.18.21.23). Most references are found in the *Parivāra* (Vin V 1,8; 2,4.5, etc. [*sādharaṇa*/**asādharaṇapaññatti*]), the youngest part of the *Vinayapiṭaka*. See also Hüsken 1997, 20 n. 40. The terms are then used in Kkh, where they are part of the classification of each rule, given at the end of the respective rule. A rule is either *sādharaṇapaññatti* (Kkh 64,16; 72,20; 77,11, etc.) or *asādharaṇapaññatti* (Kkh 63,4; 68,11, etc.). In Sp the classification is not yet as stringent as in Kkh, and thus the fact that rules are shared or unshared is described with these terms, but also with the words *ekatopaññatta* and *ubhatopaññatta* as in the case of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya section (Sp IV 919,20f., see below n. 59) or with detailed descriptions.

2. For this see Hüsken 1997, 19.

3. Why the *Vinaya* does not give this information at the beginning of the Pārājika section, is unclear. This missing statement could be a sign that such information did not belong to the text from the very beginning.

4. Since they are not commented upon in Sp (IV 906,18; 916,9; 919,29; 948,20) or Kkh (286,6; 301,5; 309,5; 368,6) it is not possible to say when they were added or whether they existed from the very beginning.

5. Pārājika (Sp IV 906,9–13, below, n. 8), Saṅghādisesa (Sp IV 915,23–916,2, below, n. 45), Nissaggiya-Pācittiya (Sp IV 919,10–23, below, n. 59), [Suddha-]Pācittiya (Sp IV 947,18–948,2, below, n. 68).

6. Pārājika (Kkh 285,5–8, below, n. 8), Saṅghādisesa (Kkh 298,1–2; below, n. 36), Nissaggiya-Pācittiya (Kkh 308,1–3; below, n. 51), [Suddha-]Pācittiya (Kkh 366,25–367,2; below, n. 65); in case of the Pāṭidesaniya rules Kkh does not comment on the *udditthā*-sentence of Pāṭ (226,21), probably because in this section no merging of shared and unshared rules took place.

Class of offences	Number of rules unique to bhikkhunīs	Total number of rules for bhikkhunīs	Number of shared rules in the <i>Bhikkhupātimokkha</i>
Pārājika	4	8	4
Saṅghādisesa	10	17	7
Nissaggiya-Pācittiya	12	30	18
Pācittiya	96	166	70
Pātidesaniya	8	8	0

Table 2: Relation of the total number of rules for bhikkhunīs and the rules unique to bhikkhunīs

As the juxtaposition of the numbers in Table 2 shows, the situation is clear with respect to the Pārājika and Pātidesaniya sections. The total number of eight Pārājikas for bhikkhunīs together with the simultaneous presentation of four Pārājikas unique to bhikkhunīs indicates that all four bhikkhu Pārājika rules are shared rules that are valid for bhikkhunīs too. Despite the fact that it is not stated in the *Vinaya* how the rules are to be grouped together, that is, which of the Pārājika rules come first in the complete BhnīPāt, there is internal evidence that the shared rules are to be placed at the beginning. Actually seven of the eight Pārājika rules start the final sentence with *ayam pi* (“he/she too”; namely Pār 2 to 8). Only the first Pārājika from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* is formulated without *pi*. This is evidence that Pārājika one of the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* also is the first Pārājika in a complete BhnīPāt.⁷ This sequence is further corroborated by commentarial literature.

At the end of the Pārājika section, Sp and Kkh in explaining the concluding sequence starting with “recited” (*udditthā*; Pāt 122,1ff.; Vin IV 223,9) mention the four shared Pārājikas from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* and the four unique to bhikkhunīs from the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*.⁸ Though this statement confirms the sequence assumed on the basis of the *Vinaya*, it cannot be taken as a reference to the sequence of the rules. This is evident from the fact that a similar sentence, with the identical succession of rules (shared rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*, unshared rules from the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*), is transmitted at the end of each category of offences (see n. 5 and 6), irrespective of the actual sequence of the rules, which in the case of the Saṅghādisesa section clearly deviates.

Kkh, however, contains other evidence. Its author begins his commentary on the BhnīPāt stating the necessity to change *bhante* into *ayye* in the Introduction (*nidāna*) to the *Pātimokkha* when recited for nuns. Furthermore, he explains how the first Pārājika for bhikkhus has to be adjusted for bhikkhunīs (Kkh 278,11–14.18ff.),⁹ and, finally, he starts commenting on the Pārājikas unique to bhikkhunīs (Kkh 279,15ff.). Thus the sequence, shared Pārājikas followed by Pārājikas unique to bhikkhunīs, is fully confirmed. This

⁷. So already Hüsken 1997, 65f.

⁸. Sp IV 906,9–13 ≠ Kkh 285,5–7: *udditthā kho ayyāyo atṭha pārājikā dhammā ti* (Vin IV 222,9; Pāt 122,1) *bhikkhū ārabba paññattā sādhāraṇā cattāro ime ca* (Kkh om.) *cattāro ti evam pātimokkhuddesamaggena udditthā kho ayyāyo atṭha pārājikā dhammā* (Kkh *atṭha pārājikā dhammā udditthā* ti (Vin IV 222,9; Pāt 122,1) *evam ettha attho daṭṭhabbo* (Kkh *veditabbo*). “**Recited, Noble ladies, are the eight rules entailing expulsion [from the community]:** the four [rules] common [to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] prescribed concerning bhikkhus, and these four (i.e. the ones unique to bhikkhunīs). Thus **the eight rules entailing expulsion [from the Saṅgha] are recited, Noble ladies** in accordance with the recitation of the Pātimokkha. Thus the meaning is to be shown (Kkh understood here.”

⁹. An indispensable piece of information, since the wording of this first Pārājika for bhikkhunīs differs essentially from Pār 1 M.

grouping also is the logical choice from the point of view of content, since the four shared Pārājika rules are the basic rules for the entire Saṅgha. It is, furthermore, confirmed by the fact that this is the chosen sequence in the complete *Bhikṣunīprātimokṣas* of all Buddhist schools (Table 3).¹⁰

Th	Dh	Sarv	Mūlasarv	Mahīś	Mahās
<u>4 Pārājikas from the Bhikkhu-/Bhikṣuvibhaṅga</u>					
4 Pārājikas from the Bhikkhunī-/Bhikṣunīvibhaṅga					

Table 3: Arrangement of the rules according to their origin (underlined: shared rules from the *Bhikkhu-/Bhikṣuvibhaṅga*)

Thus the circumstances are unclear only with respect to the three classes of Saṅghādisesa, Nissaggiya-Pācittiya and [Suddha-]Pācittiya rules. The *Vinaya* neither explicitly states which rules of the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* are shared or unshared,¹¹ nor gives guidelines for the grouping of the shared rules with the rules unique to bhikkhunīs in the complete BhnīPāt.

The criteria for the selection of rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* as being shared or unshared will not be discussed here, but a few remarks may not be out of place. With some degree of certainty it can be concluded from the content of a rule whether it is a shared or unshared rule. For instance, gender-specific rules¹² and rules regulating the bhikkhus' behaviour vis-à-vis bhikkhunīs cannot apply to bhikkhunīs (unless a similar behaviour is also possible for a bhikkhunī towards a bhikkhu),¹³ and, therefore, are to be classified as "unshared". Behaviours ruled for bhikkhus in one class of offences remain unique to them, i.e. unshared, if the same behaviour in case of bhikkhunīs is dealt with in another class of offences.¹⁴ But the applicability or inapplicability of a bhikkhu's rule to bhikkhunīs may not be safely deducible from every rule as the variance in classifying one and the same rule in various Buddhist schools shows.¹⁵ Or it simply is not deducible – at least from our modern perspective – because no obvious reason is discernible why they should not apply to

¹⁰. See already Hüsken 1997, 65f. with n. 118.

¹¹. So already Hüsken 1997, 20, who referred to the fact that the youngest part of the *Vinaya*, the *Parivāra*, includes statements with respect to this question for a limited number of rules.

¹². As, for example, emission of semen (*sukkhavissaṭṭhi*, Sgh 1 M), and speaking in praise of ministering to one's own sensual pleasure in the presence of a woman (*attakāmapāricariya*, Sgh 4 M).

¹³. Addressing a woman with lewd words (*duṭṭhullavācā*, Sgh 3 M) could have a counterpart for bhikkhunīs if one assumed that it was considered possible that a nun might speak in such a way to bhikkhus (or to men in general). Since, however, this would go against all rules of etiquette in ancient India, it is highly unlikely that this rule applies to bhikkhunīs. This is corroborated by the classification of this rule as unique to bhikkhus in commentarial literature.

¹⁴. As, for example, Sgh 2 M ruling the question of bodily contact (*kāyasamsagga*) cannot apply to bhikkhunīs, since that same behaviour in case of bhikkhunīs is dealt with in the first Pārājika unique to bhikkhunīs (Pāt 118,11–15).

¹⁵. Thus Theravāda BhPāt Niss 4 prohibits bhikkhus to have an old robe washed or dyed, etc., by a bhikkhunī not related, Niss 5 prohibits bhikkhus to accept a robe from the hand of a bhikkhunī not related (Pāt 30,1–9). Following the classification of the commentaries these rules are unique to bhikkhus (Kkh 108,9, 109,26 *asādhāraṇapāññatti*). The Mūlasarvāstivādins are the only school to transmit equivalent rules in the *Bhikṣunīprātimokṣa*, namely NP 4, 5 (Kabilsingh 1991, 290). It would be interesting to see whether these rules are contained in all three lines of Mūlasarvāstivāda bhikṣunī traditions traced by Clarke 2012, or whether the differences determined by him via the number and sequence of the Pāyantikas, are also traceable in this section of the *Bhikṣunīprātimokṣa*.

bhikkhunīs as in the case of Sgh 6 M (making a hut, *kuṭikāra*) and Sgh 7 M (building a dwelling-place, *vihārakāra*) which, according to the commentaries, are both unique to bhikkhus.¹⁶ They neither fall under the category of gender-specific rules, nor do they touch on an activity (building activities) prohibited for bhikkhunīs.¹⁷ Eventually *kuṭis* or *vihāras* of such small dimensions as described in these rules were considered inadequate dwelling places for bhikkhunīs, since the latter had to live in settlements together with at least a second nun; but this is a mere guess.¹⁸ A thorough examination of the rules from this perspective might illuminate the degree to which the classification of the commentators originates from the *Vinaya* text itself.

The present contribution, however, focuses on the sequence of the rules of the Sanghādisesa, Nissaggiya-Pācittiya, and [Suddha-]Pācittiya sections in the complete BhnīPāt. In the following we will look briefly at the transmission of the complete BhnīPāt, before we deal with the commentarial statements concerning the arrangement of the rules.

2. The complete *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha*

Editions of the Theravāda BhnīPāt comprising all rules valid for bhikkhunīs have been transmitted in the various Theravāda countries' editions of Kkh, the commentary on both *Pātimokkhas*. There the BhnīPāt, preceded by the BhPāt, is positioned at the head of the commentary.¹⁹ This holds true for the database CSCD (Chatthasaṅgāyana CD-Rom), containing the Pāli texts as recited during the sixth council (*saṅgāyana*) of the Burmese tradition (1954–56),²⁰ and for the database BudSir (Buddhist Scriptures Information Retrieval) of Mahidol University (Thailand) transmitting the Pāli texts following the Siamese tradition. Hence there are complete BhnīPāts in the Burmese, Sinhalese, and Siamese editions of Kkh, and in the databases.²¹

Furthermore, there are several editions of the complete BhnīPāt: Ranganath D. Vadekar published a Devanāgarī script version in Poona in 1939, based on some undetermined Burmese and Sinhalese editions as well as on Oldenberg's *Vinaya* edition (Vin).²² Mōhan Wijayaratna edited the BhnīPāt in an appendix to his book *Les moniales bouddhistes: naissance et développement du monachisme féminin*, in Paris in 1991, based on the Sinhalese edition by Rerukanē Chandavimala dating from 1956.²³ Wijayaratna's book was translated into English, and published in Colombo in 2001, and in a revised edition in Kandy in 2010. In 2001 Norman and Pruitt published an edition with an English translation of both complete

^{16.} Kkh 68,11; 69,20f.; Sp 915,23ff.

^{17.} In Pāc 115 N a nun has a large dwelling place (*mahallakam vihāram*) built, which indicates that being involved in building activities was not prohibited for nuns.

^{18.} Further thoughts by Horner are found in BD III, xxxviii.

^{19.} See Pāt lvii.

^{20.} Called “text of the two Mātikās” (*dve mātikāpāli*). *Mātikā* is a common name for the *Pātimokkha*. The placement of the *Pātimokkhas* at the head of the Kkh editions has misled recent scholars with respect to the classification of the *Pātimokkhas* in Pāli literature. Fiordalis (2014, 91) characterizes the “Dvemātikāpāli” as “a later Burmese compilation of monastic rules and commentary upon them.” Sujato (2009, 121) classifies them as commentaries (“The Pali Vinaya commentaries, such as the Dvemātikāpāli”), and quotes text – which actually stems from Kkh 278,23 – with the reference “Dvemātikāpāli” (without giving a page number; Sujato 2009, 130, n. 47).

^{21.} See Norman & Pruitt in Pāt xxxvi.

^{22.} So Vadekar 1939 at the bottom of the unpaginated page of Contents.

^{23.} So Nyanatusita in Wijayaratna 2010, ix.

Pātimokkhas. They used the various countries' editions of the complete BhnīPāt at the beginning of the Kkh editions, the earlier separate editions (Vadekar 1939, Wijayaratna 1991), as well as manuscripts. In Wijayaratna's revised 2010 edition the editor, Bhikkhu Nyanatusita, in addition to the sources used by Wijayaratna, compared the edition by Norman and Pruitt, as well as three older Sinhalese editions from 1895, 1914, 1924, the Burmese edition as contained on the CSCD, and the Siamese edition as represented by BudSir.²⁴ As the number of variants given in this edition shows, the traditions deviate here and there as to readings, but all present the rules in the same sequence. We do not know how far this creation of the BhnīPāt dates back, the oldest known edition dating from 1895, the oldest known manuscript being probably from the first half of the 19th century CE.²⁵ Given that the *bhikkhunīsaṅgha* in the Theravāda tradition became extinct most likely in the beginning of the eleventh century CE,²⁶ and in light of the fact that the bhikkhus' ordination lineage of present day Sri Lanka was revived only in 1753 CE by importing an ordination lineage from Siam, it is highly likely that the complete BhnīPāts, as we have them today, are a product of the nineteenth century CE.²⁷ This does not mean that in earlier times there did not exist complete BhnīPāts. On the contrary, for the fortnightly *pātimokkha* recitation the bhikkhunīs needed a complete *Pātimokkha*, and it can be taken for granted that – like *kammavācā* collections – also complete BhnīPāts were separately transmitted. The existence of the Kkh commenting on the separately transmitted *Pātimokkhas* is proof enough. But it might be that manuscripts of the BhnīPāt were not copied as regularly as manuscripts of the BhPāt tradition once the *bhikkhunīsaṅgha* was extinct.

3. Arrangement of the rules in the *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha*

3.1 Remarks regarding the commentaries

Sp as well as Kkh contain guidelines for the arrangement of the rules in a complete BhnīPāt. Both commentaries are attributed to Buddhaghosa by tradition. For none of them is this ascription proved; and for both it has been disputed.²⁸ Their diverging attitude with regard to a multiple number of aspects,²⁹ including the arrangement of the rules dealt with here, proves beyond doubt that the two commentaries stem from different authors.³⁰ It is, furthermore,

²⁴. Wijayaratna 2010, 197.

²⁵. See the number of manuscripts in the Fragile Palm Leaves Collection mentioned by Norman & Pruitt (Pāt, p. XXXVI, n. 1), and the still larger number now contained in the FPL Databank (<http://fpl.tusita.org/manuscripts/>; last access 18.01.2016). The eldest of these manuscripts dates from around the middle of the 19th century CE.

²⁶. Skilling 1993; Kieffer-Püllz 2013, I 254ff.

²⁷. Neither Siam nor Burma had a bhikkhunī ordination tradition after the 11th c. CE. The commentators when commenting on the *Pātimokkha* restricted themselves to the BhPāt, as shown by Nāṇakitti's *Pātimokkha-gaṇṭhidīpanī* written in Northern Thailand in 1492/3 (ed. Payiyāgala Vimalarāmī Tissa, Alutgama: Saddhammappakāsa 1927), and by Vicittālaṅkāra's *Pātimokkhapadattha-anuvaṇṇanā* written in Burma in 1791(?) CE (Kieffer-Püllz & Peters 2009, 276f.).

²⁸. Von Hinüber 1996, §§ 221, 224, 307.

²⁹. Differences regarding the names of the chapters (*vagga*) and rules (von Hinüber 1996, § 223) might have crept in during the transmission process; more developed stages may be explained by a chronological gap (Kieffer-Püllz 2012, 20–24); but differences in terminology (von Hinüber 1992, 62ff.), and in the classification of single rules (Kieffer-Püllz 2013, I 239 [ad Sekhiya 1]) hint at different authors.

³⁰. The colophon as given in the Kkh edition by Norman & Pruitt (the Kkh edition by Maskell does not contain a *nigamana*) is misrepresented. Only Kkh 370,3–16 is the individual *nigamana* of Kkh (printed already in von Hinüber 1995b, 131). The additional text printed thereafter (Kkh 370,17–374,19) is a reproduction of

clear that Kkh originated after Sp, since it silently as well as openly borrows from the earlier commentary.³¹ In the following we will examine the sequence of the rules of the Saṅghādisesa, Nissaggiya-Pācittiya and [Suddha-]Pācittiya sections as assigned by these two commentaries.

3.2 Arrangement of the Saṅghādisesa rules in the *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha*

3.2.1 Arrangement of the Saṅghādisesa rules in the *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha* according to the *Vinaya*

Similar to the formulation of the rules in the Pārājika section the final sentence in the Saṅghādisesa rules unique to bhikkhunīs also begins with “she too” (*ayam pi*).³² Only in the first Saṅghādisesa rule unique to bhikkhunīs (Vin IV 224,27) the sentence starts merely with *ayam*.³³ This fact has been interpreted by Horner (BD III, xxxiv) and Hüsken (1997, 110) as possible evidence that the rules in the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* classified as rules common to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs may not yet have been framed at the time when the first Saṅghādisesa rule unique to bhikkhunīs was drawn up, an idea highly improbable given the fact that the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* as a whole is younger, and dependent on the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*.³⁴ Another possible interpretation of this finding is that the first Saṅghādisesa rule unique to bhikkhunīs was considered the first in the complete set of Saṅghādisesa rules for bhikkhunīs,³⁵ and thus, that there was no necessity to refer back to a preceding rule of the same class which was to be fetched from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*.

the *Samuṭṭhāna* chapter of the *Parivāra* (Vin V 86,27–87,5.7–24,26–88,2.4–12,14–22,24–36,38–89,4.6–12,14–18,20–25,27–30,32–34,36–90,1.2–5), and, the final prose portion (Kkh 375,1–15) is, as observed already by von Hinüber (1995b, 132), found in all commentaries ascribed to Buddhaghosa. From the individual part of the colophon it is clear that the author of Kkh leaned on text and early commentarial literature (*sīhaṭṭhakathā*) as transmitted by the Mahāvihārvāsin. Thus he follows the same tradition as the author of Sp.

³¹ Kieffer-Pütz forthcoming, first example of reuse (Kkh borrows from Sp).

³² This sentence is used only in the Saṅghādisesa rules for bhikkhunīs, not in those for bhikkhus (see already Horner, BD III, xxxiiiff.). Interestingly the shared Saṅghādisesa rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*, when transferred to the complete BhnīPāt are adjusted to that formulation, i.e. the sentence found in the rules unique to bhikkhunīs is also inserted in the shared rules, see Sgh 7–9 in BhnīPāt (Pāt 128,2–25), and Sgh 14–17 in BhnīPāt (Pāt 136,8–140,27). Thus the sentence beginning with *ayam pi* (twice *imā pi*) is found in all Saṅghādisesa rules in the BhnīPāt except in the first.

³³ In their *Pātimokkha* edition Norman & Pruitt insert the *pi* also in the first Saṅghādisesa of the BhnīPāt (Pāt 124,7) hinting at the fact that Vin E^e and Wijayaratna (i.e. C^e) omit it. Actually the Burmese (CSCD) and the Siamese editions (BudSir) also do not have a *pi* here, a fact not noted in Pāt. It is unclear on what basis Norman & Pruitt added the *pi*. But observe that Vadekar 1939, 29,11, who bases himself on some unidentified Burmese and Sri Lankan editions as well as on Vin, also inserts the *pi*.

³⁴ Though the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* shows the same structure, it seems to be artificially created. Nearly all rules originated in Sāvatthī (123 of 130 unique to bhikkhunīs), which as Schopen has shown is the place to be mentioned in case one cannot remember the historical setting of a rule (Schopen 1997, 578; see also Anālayo 2014, 19 n. 17). In the seven instances where this is not the case, the place of origin (Rājagaha: Pāc 10, 38–40, 81 N; Sakkesu: Pāc 5, 58 N; Vesāli: Pāc 52 N) is dictated by the stories referred to or the location of the persons involved (see already Horner, BD III, xlff.). Only three persons are named as first wrong doers (Thullanandā [35x], Sundarīnandā [2x], Caṇḍakālī [6x]), otherwise the six nuns (*chabbaggyā* [15x]), or some anonymous groups (*aññatarā* [17x], *sambahulā* [43x], *dve* [2x]), cause the incident that leads to the rule. Thus there are only seven first wrong-doers including three individuals compared to twenty-three first wrong-doers in the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*, of which sixteen are individual monks.

³⁵ See already Horner, BD III, xxxiv.

3.2.2 Arrangement of the Saṅghādisesa rules in the *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha* according to the *Kaṅkhāvitaranī*

As for the Pārājika rules, so too for the Saṅghādisesa rules, Kkh has a sentence giving the total number of rules:

“Recited, Noble ladies, are the seventeen rules entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha: seven [rules] common [to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] prescribed concerning bhikkhus, ten [rules] unique [to bhikkhunīs], thus there are seventeen.”³⁶

This sentence, like the passage on the Pārājika rules (see above, n. 8), etc., simply informs us of the number of shared rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*, and the number of rules unique to bhikkhunīs from the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*. That this is not meant as a guideline for the sequential arrangement of the rules is obvious from various other passages in the Kkh commentary on the Saṅghādisesa section. Thus this sentence here and elsewhere is simply meant as a summary of the total number of rules and their distribution over the two *Vibhaṅgas*.

Kkh enumerates the rules in the text itself (i.e. not in headings or subheadings which might be secondary). Thus the numbering, reflected in all Kkh editions,³⁷ can be understood as belonging to the original text. In Sp the rules are numbered too, but its author follows the numbering of the rules in the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*, that is without taking into consideration the rules to be inserted from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*. Thus the two commentaries deviate in their numbering as shown in Table 4.³⁸

No	Name in Sp E ^e B ^e C ^e N ^e	Name in Kkh E ^e B ^e C ^e
1	<i>paṭhama</i>	<i>paṭhama</i>
2	<i>dutiya</i>	<i>dutiya</i>
3	<i>tatiya</i>	<i>tatiya</i>
4	<i>catuttha</i>	<i>catuttha</i>
5	<i>pañcama</i>	<i>pañcama</i>
6	<i>chaṭṭha</i>	<i>chaṭṭha</i>
		<i>sattama-atiṭṭhama-nava</i> with reference to the <i>Bhikkhuvibhaṅga</i>
7	<u><i>sattama</i></u>	<u><i>dasama</i></u>
8	<u><i>atthama</i></u>	<u><i>ekādasama</i></u>
9	<u><i>navama</i></u>	<u><i>dvādasama</i></u>
10	<u><i>dasama</i></u>	<u><i>terasama</i></u>
		<i>saṅghabhedādīsu catūsu</i> as reference to the four rules to be taken over from the <i>Bhikkhuvibhaṅga</i>

Table 4: The numbering of the Saṅghādisesa rules unique to bhikkhunīs in Sp and Kkh (underlined: rules counted differently in the two commentaries)

³⁶ Kkh 298,1–2: *udditthā kho ayyāyo sattarasa saṅghādisesā dhammā ti* (Pāt 142,1) *bhikkhū ārabba paññattā sādhāraṇā satta, asādhāraṇā dasā ti evaṃ sattarasa*.

³⁷ *saṅghādisesu paṭhame* (Kkh 286,7), *dutiye* (Kkh 287,24), *tatiye* (Kkh 289,6), *catutthe* (Kkh 291,7), *pañcame* (Kkh 291,28), *chaṭṭhe* (Kkh 292,23). Then follows the remark regarding the seventh to ninth rules (Kkh 293,15f., see n. 2) and, thereafter, the next Saṅghādisesa rule unique to bhikkhunīs listed in the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* as the seventh rule (Vin IV 235,21–237,29) is introduced with the words “in the tenth [rule]” (*dasame*, Kkh 294,10).

³⁸ The names listed in Table 4 are those also given as headings or subheadings in the editions. Since in both commentaries the explanations of the single rules start with a reference to the number of the rule, these headings or subheadings, even if they are quite modern, are based on the numbering found in the text.

In the first column we have the sequential number of the Saṅghādisesa rules unique to bhikkhunīs, namely ten. This numbering corresponds to that in Sp (second column). Kkh (third column) deviates from it. The first six rules are counted as one to six, but the seventh to tenth rules in the first two columns are counted as ten to thirteen in the third column (Kkh 292,23; 294,10ff.). This shows that between the sixth and the seventh rule listed in the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* three rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* are to be inserted. It is, however, not clear from this numbering which rules these are.

For this we can resort to the *Vinaya*. According to Vin IV 242,12ff. the total of seventeen Saṅghādisesa rules for bhikkhunīs — ten unique to bhikkhunīs, and seven shared rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* — consist of nine rules with an immediate offence (*paṭhamāpattika*), and eight rules with an offence after the third ineffective admonition (*yāvatatiyaka*).³⁹ Thus there are nine *paṭhamāpattika*-rules and eight *yāvatatiyaka*-rules which each have to be arranged together. Since from the bhikkhus' rules Sgh 5, 8 and 9 M are *paṭhamāpattika*, whereas Sgh 10–13 M are *yāvatatiyaka*,⁴⁰ it is clear that Sgh 5, 8–9 M have to be combined with Sgh 1–6 N (*pathamāpattika*), and Sgh 10–13 M with Sgh 7–10 N (*yāvatatiyaka*). But whether the rules unique to bhikkhunīs are followed by those common to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs or vice versa is not evident. Here Kkh comes into play. After the sixth Saṅghādisesa rule unique to bhikkhunīs it says:

“The regulation of the seventh, eighth and ninth [Saṅghādisesa] rule [for nuns] is to be understood exactly according to the method stated in the triad [of Saṅghādisesa rules for monks] beginning with the [rule about] acting as a go-between (i.e. Sgh 5, 8, 9 M).”⁴¹

This sentence makes clear that after Sgh 6 N the first three rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* are to be inserted. This tallies with the numbering of the rules in the text of Kkh described above. Likewise, Kkh after the tenth Saṅghādisesa rule unique to bhikkhunīs (counted as the thirteenth rule in Kkh 296,31) states:

“The regulation [of the Saṅghādisesa rules fourteen to seventeen for nuns] is to be understood exactly in the manner stated in the four [Saṅghādisesa rules for monks] beginning with a split of the Saṅgha. Only that a bhikkhunī does not split the Saṅgha,⁴²

³⁹. Vin IV 242,12: *udditthā kho ayyāyo sattarasa saṅghādisesā dhammā, nava paṭhamāpattikā, aṭṭha yāvatatiyakā*.

⁴⁰. Unlike in the Saṅghādisesa rules unique to bhikkhunīs, the differentiation into *pathamāpattika* and *yāvatatiyaka*-rules is not explicitly stated in the bhikkhus' Saṅghādisesa rules, but only summarized at the end of the entire Saṅghādisesa section (Vin III 186,11f.; see already Horner [BD III xxxiiiff.], and Hüskens 1997, 108f.). Nevertheless, the classification as a *yāvatatiyaka*-rule is implicit from the relevant Pātimokha rules themselves (Sgh 10–13 M; Vin III 173,2; 175,26f.; 178,15ff.; 184,29f.), since it is expressly mentioned in them that the offence entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha (Saṅghādisesa) comes into being only after the third (*yāvatatiyaka*) ineffective admonition (Pāt 16,14–20,31). See Horner, BD III, xxxivf.; Hüskens 1997, 109 and n. 234.

⁴¹. Kkh 293,15–16: *sattama-aṭṭhama-navama-sikkhāpadānam sañcarittādittaye vuttanayen’ eva vinicchayo veditabbo*.

⁴². Kkh 297,19 reads *na bhindati* noting that the Sinhalese edition omits the *na* (Kkh 297 n. 15). The reading of the Sinhalese edition is what one would expect, since that rule is common to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs. Hence one should assume that a bhikkhu splits the *bhikkhusaṅgha* whereas a bhikkhunī splits the *bhikkhunīsaṅgha*. But as the statements in the *Vinaya* and the commentarial literature make plain *na bhindati* is the correct reading. All texts speak of Saṅgha without specification, and without a specification

but she strives for the split and she acts in conformity (with a split).”⁴³

These two Kkh statements clearly indicate that rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* have to be inserted, which rules these are, and at which position in the list of rules unique to bhikkhunīs they have to be positioned (see Table 5).

No	Numbering in Kkh	Rule	Type of offence
1	paṭhama	Sgh 1 N	paṭhamāpattika
2	dutiya	Sgh 2 N	paṭhamāpattika
3	tatiya	Sgh 3 N	pathamāpattika
4	catuttha	Sgh 4 N	pathamāpattika
5	pañcama	Sgh 5 N	pathamāpattika
6	chaṭṭha	Sgh 6 N	paṭhamāpattika
7	<u>sattama</u>	<u>Sgh 5 M</u>	<u>pathamāpattika</u>
8	<u>atthama</u>	<u>Sgh 8 M</u>	<u>pathamāpattika</u>
9	<u>navama</u>	<u>Sgh 9 M</u>	<u>pathamāpattika</u>
10	dasama	Sgh 7 N	yāvatatiyaka
11	ekādasama	Sgh 8 N	yāvatatiyaka
12	dvādasama	Sgh 9 N	yāvatatiyaka
13	terasama	Sgh 10 N	yāvatatiyaka
14	<u>not named by number</u>	<u>Sgh 10 M</u>	<u>yāvatatiyaka</u>
15	<u>not named by number</u>	<u>Sgh 11 M</u>	<u>yāvatatiyaka</u>
16	<u>not named by number</u>	<u>Sgh 12 M</u>	<u>yāvatatiyaka</u>
17	<u>not named by number</u>	<u>Sgh 13 M</u>	<u>yāvatatiyaka</u>

Table 5: Arrangement of the complete Bhikkhunī Saṅghādisesa rules (underlined: shared rules taken from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*)

Saṅgha is understood to refer to the *bhikkhusaṅgha*. Thus what is meant is that a bhikkhunī does not split a *bhikkhusaṅgha* (for details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013, III [Z 431]). The passages run as follows: Vin II 204,4–6: *na kho, Upāli, bhikkhunī saṅgham bhindati api ca bhedāya parakkamati, na sikkhamānā ..., na sāmañero, ...* “Upāli, a nun does not split an Order even if she goes forward with a schism ... a probationer ... a novice ...” (BD V 286). Kkh-nt. 252,13–14 [Sgh 10 M]: *kiñcāpi bhikkhunī saṅgham na bhindati, api ca kho bhedāya parakkamati ti sādhāraṇapāññattī ti* (Kkh 77,11). “Although a nun does not split the Saṅgha, she nevertheless attempts to cause a split. [Insofar Sgh 10 M is classified as] **a prescription in common [for both bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs].**” Kkh-nt 461,11–12 [Sgh 14 N]: *bhikkhunī saṅgham na bhindatī ti* (Kkh 297,19) *kammam, uddeso cā ti dvīhi bhedo, so tāya saddhiṃ natthī ti.* “A nun does not split the Saṅgha: a split [occurs] by two [elements], by a legal procedure (*kamma*) and by a recitation (*uddesa*). This does not exist together with her (i.e. the nun)”. This explanation clearly shows that splitting a Sangha always is understood to refer to a *bhikkhusaṅgha*. Moh 200,3–6: *purimāni c’ ettha cattāri sabbesam gahaṭhapabbajitānam sādhāraṇāni, saṅghabhedo pana pakatattassa bhikkhuno va, asādhāraṇo aññesam, bhikkhunī pi hi saṅgham na bhindati, pag eva itare.* “And here the first four [acts of immediate retribution] are common to all householders and recluses. But a split of the Sangha [is unique to] a monk of good standing (i.e. not undergoing probation, etc.) only, it is not shared with others; for, even a nun does not split the Sangha, how much less others.” We have to assume that the characterisation of *saṅghabheda* as unshared (*asādhāraṇa*) is not meant in the technical Vinaya sense here, since that rule (Sgh 10 M) is qualified as a *sādhāraṇa* rule (Kkh 77,11).

⁴³ Kkh 297,18–20: *saṅghabhedātīsu catūsu vuttanayen’ eva vinicchayo veditabbo. kevalam bhikkhunī saṅgham* (Kkh erroneously *bhikkhunīsaṅgham*) *na bhindati, bhedāya pana parakkamati c’ eva anuvattati ca.*

3.2.3 Arrangement of the Saṅghādisesa rules in the *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha* according to the *Samantapāśādikā*

As stated already, Sp keeps to the numbering of the rules as they are transmitted in Vin. Thus the numbering of the rules in Sp does not contain any hint as to the position of the rules in a complete BhnīPāt. Unlike Kkh, Sp also does not make any remarks after the sixth and tenth rules unique to bhikkhunīs. But it has an exact description of how the rules are to be grouped in the concluding commentary on the Saṅghādisesa section of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* (Pāt 162,1ff.; Vin IV 242,12ff.):⁴⁴

Recited, Noble ladies, are the seventeen rules entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha: here nine [rules] with offences at once [are to be understood as follows]: having inserted immediately after the six [rules of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*] with offences at once (Sgh 1–6 N) the three following rules from the *Mahāvibhaṅga*, [namely] “the rule about acting as a go-between” (Sgh 5 M) [and] the “two [rules about] being corrupted and corrupting” (Sgh 8, 9 M); **eight [rules] with offences after the third [admonition]** is to be understood [as follows]: having inserted immediately after the four [rules of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*] with offences after the third [admonition] (Sgh 7–10 N) the four [rules] with offences after the third [admonition] from the *Mahāvibhaṅga* too (Sgh 10–13 M). In that manner all **the seventeen rules entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha are recited, Noble ladies** in accordance with the recitation of the *Pātimokkha*. Thus the meaning is to be shown here.⁴⁵

As is evident from this passage Sp agrees with Kkh in the arrangement of the Saṅghādisesa rules in a complete BhnīPāt.⁴⁶ This in fact also is the arrangement we find in the present day editions of the complete BhnīPāt.

3.2.4 Arrangement of the Saṅghādisesa rules in other schools' *Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣas*

A detailed comparison with the other Buddhist schools' *Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣas* is not possible here. As we got to know recently through Clarke's detection of various sub-branches of the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition,⁴⁷ this would require a thorough analysis of all relevant texts of all the schools, since one school might have several sub-branches which might deviate regarding

⁴⁴. The relevance of this explanation of Sp has already been stated by I. B. Horner (BD III, xxxvii). A first translation of this passage is found in Hüskens 1997, 103, n. 208 (the passage needs to be corrected in the sense of the above given translation).

⁴⁵. Sp IV 915,23–916,2: *udditthā kho ayyāyo sattarasa saṅghādisesā ti* (Vin IV 242,12) *ettha channam paṭhamāpattikānam anantarā sañcarittam, dve duṭṭhadosā ti imāni tīṇi sikkhāpadāni Mahāvibhaṅgato pakkhipitvā nava paṭhamāpattikā* (Vin IV 242,12f.); *catunnaṃ yāvatatiyakānam anantarā Mahāvibhaṅgato pi cattāro yāvatatiyake pakkhipitvā atṭha yāvatatiyakā* (Vin IV 242,13) *veditabbā. evam sabbe pi pātimokkhuddesamaggena udditthā kho ayyāyo sattarasa saṅghādisesā dhammā ti* (Vin IV 242,12) *evam ettha attho datṭhabbo.*

⁴⁶. Von Hinüber 1995a: 19, states that “Saṅghādisesa X–XIII of the monks are inserted between Saṅghādisesa IX and X of the nuns according to the commentary (Sp 915,34–38)”. This would mean that the *tatiyāpattika*-rules for bhikkhus came first, followed by the *tatiyāpattika*-rules for bhikkhunīs if we understand von Hinüber's “Saṅghādisesa IX and X” as a reference to the numbers the rules have in the complete BhnīPāt. If it referred to the numbers of rules unique to bhikkhunīs, then these monks' rules would be inserted in between Sgh 9 and 10 of the rules unique to bhikkhunīs, which would lead to again another sequence. The commentarial passage von Hinüber bases this statement on is the same as the one given above (his lines 34–38 are typos for 24 and 28). Therefore, his statement is erroneous.

⁴⁷. Clarke 2012.

the sequence and number of the rules in their *Prātimokṣas*. But a rough first comparison will throw some light on the position of the Theravāda tradition in relation to the *Vinayas* of the other Buddhist schools.⁴⁸ As a basis for this comparison we refer to Kabil Singh's rendering of the *Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣas* of the schools of the Theravāda, Dharmaguptaka, Sarvāstivāda, Mahīśāsaka, Mūlasarvāstivāda and Mahāsāṃghika traditions (Kabil Singh 1991).

All schools arrange the rules so that the equivalents to the *pāṭhamāpattika-rules* from *Bhikkhu-* and *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* are grouped together, and likewise the equivalents to the *yāvatatiyaka-rules* are also grouped together. Unlike the Theravāda tradition, however, all other traditions begin the Saṅghādisesa section with the equivalents to the three *pāṭhamāpattika-rules* from the *Bhikṣuvibhaṅgas*, corresponding to Sgh 5, 8–9 M of the Theravāda *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* and Sgh 7–9 N of the complete Theravāda BhñīPāt, respectively. They then add the equivalents to the *pāṭhamāpattika-rules* from the *Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*.⁴⁹ With the exception of the Mūlasarvāstivāda all other schools proceed with the equivalents to the *yāvatatiyaka-rules* from the *Bhikṣuvibhaṅgas* followed by the equivalents to the *yāvatatiyaka-rules* from the *Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅgas*, in a manner completely parallel to the *pāṭhamāpattika* section. Only the Mūlasarvāstivāda texts arrange them the other way round (see Table 6).

Th	Dh	Sarv	Mūlasarv	Mahiś	Mahās
6 Sgh N p	<u>Sgh M p</u>				
<u>3 Sgh M p</u>	Sgh N p				
4 Sgh N y	<u>Sgh M y</u>	Sgh N y		<u>Sgh M y</u>	
<u>4 Sgh M y</u>	Sgh N y		<u>Sgh M y</u>	Sgh N y	

Table 6: Schematic arrangement of the Saṅghādisesa rules of the various schools (underlined: shared rules from the *Bhikṣu-/Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*; p = *pāṭhamāpattika*; y = *yāvatatiyaka*)

This comparison shows that the Theravāda tradition deviates from all other schools in having the Saṅghādisesa section of the complete BhñīPāt begin with the rules unique to bhikkhunīs. If the reading *ayam* (not *ayam pi*) in the first Saṅghādisesa unique to bhikkhunīs is an intended reading from early on, this would be evidence for the indication of such an arrangement already in the *Vinaya* of the Theravāda school.

3.3 Arrangement of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules in the *Bhikkhunīpātimokkhā*

In the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya section bhikkhus have thirty Nissaggiya rules, as do bhikkhunīs. But the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* contains only twelve Nissaggiya rules unique to bhikkhunīs. Hence eighteen of the thirty Nissaggiya rules for bhikkhus must be common to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs. According to Sp (IV 919,10–23, below 3.3.2) Niss 4, 5, 11–17, 21, 24, and 29 M are unique to bhikkhus. Hence Niss 1–3, 6–10, 18–20, 22–23, 25–28 are common to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs. Kkh deviates with respect to Niss 29 M, without this being a genuine alternative.⁵⁰ How these rules are to be arranged is discussed in both commentaries.

⁴⁸ See for the various *Vinayas*, Clarke 2014, 165ff.; Clarke 2015.

⁴⁹ Some of the schools also have more rules; they spread the four subrules of Sgh 3 N over various rules and, eventually, add others, increasing the total number of Samghādisesa rules (19 – Mahāsāṃghika; 20 – Mūlasarvāstivādin).

⁵⁰ Kkh confirms the statement of Sp with the exception of Niss 29 M (Kkh 108,9 [Niss 4], 109,26 [Niss 5], 120,2 [Niss 11], 120,16 [Niss 12], 121,5 [Niss 13], 121,23 [Niss 14], 122,17 [Niss 15], 123,7 [Niss 16],

3.3.1 Arrangement of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules in the *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha* according to the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*

Kkh, like Sp, transmits the twelve rules unique to bhikkhunīs, and comments on them. Unlike Sp, where the rules are numbered as first to twelfth, Kkh numbers the first rule as “the first of the first section among the Nissaggiyas” (*nissaggiyesu ādivaggassa tāva pathame*, Kkh 301,5), enumerating the remaining rules in this *vagga* as second to tenth, proceeding with “the first in the second [section]” for the eleventh (*dutiyassa pathame*, Kkh 306,17), and with “the second” (*dutiye*, Kkh 307,14) for the twelfth rule. Thus, the sequential arrangement of the Nissaggiya Pācittiya rules in Kkh is identical with that in Sp, and Kkh only deviates in mentioning *vaggas*, and the numbering of the last two rules. Unlike in the Saṅghādisesa section, Kkh here does not contain any comment in between these twelve rules indicating any insertion of a rule from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* or vice versa. Seen in light of the fact that Kkh gives clear guidelines for the arrangement of the rules in its commentary on the Saṅghādisesa rules, it can be safely assumed that the twelve rules unique to bhikkhunīs remain in a closed block also in the complete BhnīPāt. At the end of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*'s Nissaggiya-Pācittiya section, after the last of the Nissaggiya rules unique to bhikkhunīs (i.e. Niss 12 N), Kkh contains the following text:

“The commentary on the rule about light cloth is finished (Niss 12 N).

From here on the eighteen rules – in this section eight, in the third section ten – are to be understood in the exact manner stated in the commentary to the *Bhikkhupātimokkha*.

[This is] the section on gold and silver, the third.
Recited, Noble Ladies, are the thirty rules entailing expiation with forfeiture
 [means]: eighteen [rules] common [to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] prescribed concerning bhikkhus, twelve [rules] unique [to bhikkhunīs], thus there are thirty. The remainder is absolutely clear everywhere.”⁵¹

123,24 [Niss 17], 128,26 [Niss 21], 134,23 [Niss 24]).

For the classification of Niss 29 M the Kkh refers to the second rule in the *cīvaravagga* (Kkh 141,12f.). The second rule in the *cīvaravagga* is Niss 2 M which is classified as *sādharaṇa* (Kkh 101,4). Obviously the Sinhalese tradition here goes other ways, since it gives the classification *asādharaṇa*° (Kkh 101, n. 1: “C°: asā°”), which would render Niss 29 M, as well as Niss 2 M an *asādharaṇa* rule. This classification is also taken over in the Sinhalese translation of Kkh (Kkh sinh 83,8f.). At the same time the Pāt of the Sinhalese tradition, like all other traditions, includes Niss 2 M in the *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha* (Wijayaratne 2010, 209), thus showing that it considered Niss 2 M a *sādharaṇa*-rule. Therefore, the problem is not solved by classifying Niss 2 M as *asādharaṇa*-rule. We have to assume that either the author of Kkh forgot to exclude this classification factor from his general reference to Niss 2 M or that an appropriate remark was lost during transmission. Already Vjb (ca. 10th c. CE), and Kkh-pt (between 10th and 12th c. CE) mention that no separate factors (*anga*) – referring to the constituent factors for an offence – are mentioned for the *Sāsanka*-rule (Niss 29 M) in the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* (Vjb 233,10f. = Kkh-pt 72,25ff.), thus showing that the Kkh's reference to Niss 2 M was insufficient also with respect to other elements of the classification.

⁵¹ Kkh 307,17–308,3.: *lahupāvuraṇasikkhāpadavaṇṇanā nitṭhitā*.

ito parāni imasmīni vagge aṭṭha, tatiyavagge dasā ti imāni aṭṭhārasa sikkhāpadāni

Bhikkhupātimokkhavaṇṇanāyam vuttanayen' eva veditabbānī ti.

Jātarūpavaggo tatiyo.

udditṭhā kho ayyāyo tiṁsa nissaggiyā pācittiyā dhammā ti (Pāt 44,16–17) *bhikkhū ārabba paññattā sādharaṇā aṭṭhārasa, asādharaṇā dvādasā ti evam tiṁsa. sesam sabbattha uttānam evā ti.*

This passage mentions the rules in two deviating sequences. In the first sentence immediately subsequent to the twelfth rule, we are informed that the second *vagga* is to be filled with eight rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*, and that the third *vagga* consists of ten rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*. Thus this sentence indicates that the twelve rules unique to bhikkhunīs are followed by the eighteen shared rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*. This corresponds to the numbering of the rules in the text of Kkh.

The final statement of this passage, being a commentary on the *udditthā*-sentence, first mentions the eighteen shared rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*, then the twelve unshared from the *Bhikkhunīvibhangā*. This tallies with the sequences given in the similar sentences at the end of the Pārājika (see n. 8), Saṅghādisesa (see n. 36), and [Suddha-]Pācittiya sections (see n. 65). As already stated in connection with the Saṅghādisesa section, this sentence does not refer to the sequence of the rules in the complete BhnīPāt, but rather is a mention of the total number of rules and their distribution over the *Bhikkhu-* and *Bhikkhunīvibhangas*. Hence, only the first sentence indicates the sequential arrangement of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules for bhikkhunīs (Table 7).⁵²

Arrangement of the complete Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules for bhikkhunīs according to Kkh 307,18f.:		
1. <i>vagga</i> : “first section” (<i>ādivagga</i>); “bowl section, first” (<i>pattavagga pathama</i>)		
No	Rule	Identification of rule
1	Rule about a hoard of bowls	Niss 1N
2	Rule about out-of-season robe material	Niss 2 N
3	Rule about exchanging a robe, and later tearing it away	Niss 3 N
4	Rule about asking for another thing	Niss 4 N
5	Rule about getting another thing in exchange	Niss 5 N
6	First rule about exchanging something belonging to a Saṅgha	Niss 6 N
7	Second rule about exchanging something belonging to a Saṅgha	Niss 7 N
8	First rule about exchanging something belonging to a group	Niss 8 N
9	Second rule about exchanging something belonging to a group	Niss 9 N
10	Rule about exchanging something belonging to an individual	Niss 10 N
2. <i>vagga</i> : “second [section]” (<i>dutiya</i>); ⁵³ “robe section” (<i>cīvaravagga</i>)		
11	Rule about a heavy cloth	Niss 11 N
12	Rule about a light cloth	Niss 12 N
13	Rule about kathina	Niss 1 M
14	“Storehouse” rule	Niss 2 M
15	Rule about out-of-season robe material	Niss 3 M
16	Rule about asking a non-relative	Niss 6 M
17	Rule about more than that	Niss 7 M
18	First rule about laid by (a robe fund)	Niss 8 M
19	Second rule about laid by (individual robe funds)	Niss 9 M

⁵² The passage is similar to the one after the Pācittiya rules (Kkh 366,20–367,2, see below, n. 65), also containing two different sentences.

⁵³ This is the name given for this *vagga* in the text of Kkh itself (Kkh 306,17). There is no subheading for this second *vagga* in Kkh. In Pāt 156,15 it is designated as “robes’ section, second” (*cīvaravaggo dutiyo*).

<u>20</u>	<u>Rule about kings</u>	Niss 10 M
3. <i>vagga</i> : gold and silver section (<i>jātarūpavagga</i> , Kkh C° E°); bowl section (<i>pattavagga</i> , Pāt B° S°, Kkh B°); third section (<i>tatiya vagga</i> , S°)		
<u>21</u>	<u>Rule about money</u> (<i>rūpiyasikkhapada</i>)	Niss 18 M
<u>22</u>	<u>Rule about money transactions</u>	Niss 19 M
<u>23</u>	<u>Rule about buying and selling</u>	Niss 20 M
<u>24</u>	<u>Rule about less than five mends</u>	Niss 22 M
<u>25</u>	<u>Rule about medicines</u>	Niss 23 M
<u>26</u>	<u>Rule about taking a robe away</u>	Niss 25 M
<u>27</u>	<u>Rule about asking for yarn</u>	Niss 26 M
<u>28</u>	<u>Rule about weavers</u>	Niss 27 M
<u>29</u>	<u>Rule about special robes</u>	Niss 28 M
<u>30</u>	<u>Rule about apportioned</u>	Niss 30 M

Table 7: Arrangement of the complete Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules for bhikkhunīs according to Kkh (underlined: shared rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*)

This arrangement of Kkh seems unsatisfactory from the point of view of content. The first section (*vagga*) is called “first section” (*ādivagga*) in the text of Kkh (301,5), but, in accordance with the first rule contained in this *vagga*, “bowl section” (*pattavagga*) in the subheadings (Pāt 148,5; Kkh 306,12; Kkh-nt 463,2⁵⁴). Though in total we have two rules dealing with bowls in the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya section, only one of them is contained in this *vagga*, the second being included in the third *vagga* (24 Niss N) if we follow the Kkh’s arrangement. Two other rules of this first *vagga* deal with special robes (Niss 2–3 N) and the remaining rules (Niss 4–10 N) are concerned with various requisites of different owners. Since titles for sections (*vagga*) vary in different traditions and texts, and may even be relatively recent — as obviously is the designation as *pattavagga* (bowl section) in the present case —, the titles of the *vaggas* alone are not sufficient to render an arrangement suspicious. Rather, it is the arrangement of such disparate rules in the first *vagga* — in the last *vagga* it would not be so unusual — which seems odd.

The second *vagga*, called “robes’ section” (*cīvaravagga*) in Pāt (156,15) and in the new Kkh subcommentary (Kkh-nt 465,12), starts with two rules tackling bargaining of a heavy or light cloth. Thus there appear two special rules regarding robes before any of the basic robes’ rules has been introduced. These follow only subsequently as Niss 13–15 N which correspond to Niss 1–3 M. In a logical arrangement we would expect to find the basic rules first, and rules for special robes subsequently, not vice versa.

The third section called either gold and silver section (*jātarūpavagga*, Pāt 160,23; Kkh 307,21) or bowl section (*pattavagga*)⁵⁵ contains the three important rules dealing with money

⁵⁴. Sp, and the old subcommentary on Kkh give no *vagga* names at all (Kkh-pt 113,1ff.).

⁵⁵. Given in Pāt 156, n. 5 as the reading of a Siamese edition, and qualified as inappropriate, and in Pāt 160, n. 7 as the reading of B°. In their introduction to the *Pātimokkha*-edition Norman & Pruitt (Pāt, p. XXXIX) state that the name *pattavagga* for the third *vagga* as given in B° and S° is wrong, because the *vaggas* are often named after the first rule, and the first rule in the third *vagga* is on gold and silver (*jātarūpa*). Interestingly the third *vagga* would start with a bowl rule (the rule about exchanging a bowl with less than five mends) if we followed the arrangement of the rules suggested in Sp. Thus naming the third *vagga* *pattavagga* might

(Niss 21–23), one with bowls (Niss 24), one with medicine (Niss 25), two dealing with woven things (Niss 27, 28), two rules regarding robes (Niss 26, 29), and things apportioned (Niss 30). Hence this *vagga* seems to be a collecting vessel for the remaining rules. This shows that from the point of view of content the distribution of the rules over these three, largely secondarily named, *vaggas* is not consistent.

3.3.2 Arrangement of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules in the *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha* according to the *Samantapāsādikā*

Horner in 1942⁵⁶ and Hüskens in 1997⁵⁷ both discussed the arrangement of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules according to the guideline given in Sp, without noticing the sequence suggested in Kkh. The Sp guideline runs as follows:

“Recited, Noble ladies, are the thirty rules entailing expiation with forfeiture: here having eliminated two rules from the *robe chapter* (i.e. the first *vagga*) in the *Mahāvibhaṅga*, [namely “the rule about] washing” (Niss 4 M) and “[the rule about] formally accepting” (Niss 5 M), the first chapter is to be filled up with “the rule about [robes] distributed after having taken formal possession of untimely robe-material as timely robe-material” (Niss 2 N) and “[the rule about] exchanging a robe, and later tearing it away” (Niss 3 N); furthermore, having eliminated seven rules from the beginning of the *eḷakaloma* chapter (i.e. the second *vagga* of the *Mahāvibhaṅga*), the second chapter is to be filled by inserting the seven “[rules] for something designated for benefit of another” (Niss 4–10 N). Having eliminated the following three [rules] from the third chapter [of the bhikkhus’ Nissaggiya section, namely the rules about] “the first bowl” (Niss 21 M), “the rains robe” (Niss 24 M) and “the forest”⁵⁸ (Niss 29 M), the third chapter is to be filled with the [rules about] “a hoard of bowls” (Niss 1 N), “the heavy robe” (Niss 11 N) and “the light robe” (Niss 12 N). Thus for bhikkhunīs twelve rules are prescribed for one side (i.e. the *bhikkhunīsaṅgha*), eighteen are prescribed for two sides. In that manner all **the thirty rules entailing expiation with forfeiture are recited, Noble ladies**, in accordance with the recitation of the *Pātimokkha*. Thus the meaning shall be shown here.”⁵⁹

Similar to the complete set of Saṅghādisesa rules for bhikkhunīs the arrangement suggested in Sp shows an amalgamated sequence of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules common to bhikkhus

not be a simple misprinting, but rather it may result from this different arrangement.

⁵⁶ BD III, xxxviif.

⁵⁷ Hüskens 1997, 135, n. 108, translates the guideline of Sp, and gives the grouping of the rules as Horner, to whom she also refers (p. 136, n. 110).

⁵⁸ *āraññakasikkhāpada* here and elsewhere used (Sp II 301,13) for Niss 29 M, named more often *sāsaṅka-sikkhāpada* in the Pat edition (Pat 44,1), but also in Sp (III 730,1). In Kkh the author refers to Niss 2 M for the classification of Niss 29 M which would render Niss 29 M a *sādhāraṇāpaññatti*, though it is a *asādhāraṇāpaññatti*, see n. 50.

⁵⁹ Sp IV 919,10–23: *udditthā kho ayyāyo tiṃsa nissaggiyā pācittiyā dhammā ti* (Vin IV 257,5) *ettha Mahāvibhaṅge cīvara vaggato dhovanañ ca paṭiggahaṇañ cā ti dve sikkhāpadāni apanetvā akāla cīvaraṇam kāla cīvaraṇam ti adhitthahitvā bhājitasikkhāpadena (C^e E^o vibhajita^o) ca parivattetvā acchinnacīvaraṇa ca pathamavaggo pūretabbo. puna eḷakaloma vaggassa ādito satta sikkhāpadāni apanetvā satta aññadatthikāni pakhipitvā dutiyavaggo pūretabbo. tatiyavaggato paṭhamapattanā vassikasāti kāmā āraññakasikkhāpadan (E^o araññaka^o) ti imāni tīṇi apanetvā pattasannicayagarupāvuraṇalahupāvuraṇasikkhāpadehi (C^e E^o °pāpurāṇa°-°pāpuraṇa°) tatiyavaggo (E^o vaggo) pūretabbo. iti bhikkhunīnañ dvādasa sikkhāpadāni ekato paññattāni, atthārasa ubhato paññattāni ti evam sabbe pi pātimokkhuddesamaggena *udditthā kho ayyāyo tiṃsa nissaggiyā pācittiyā dhammā ti* (Vin IV 257,5) evam ettha attho datthabho.*

and bhikkhunīs and those unique to bhikkhunīs (see Table 8).

Arrangement of the complete Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules for bhikkhunīs according to Sp IV 919,10–23		
No	Topic of the rules	Origin of the rules
1	<u>Rule about an extra robe for at most ten days</u>	Niss 1 M
2	<u>Rule about living apart from one's robe even for one night</u>	Niss 2 M
3	<u>Rule about untimely robe material</u>	Niss 3 M
4	<u>Rule about asking for robe material from a non-relative</u>	Niss 6 M
5	<u>Rule about accepting more than an upper and under-robe from a non-relative</u>	Niss 7 M
6	<u>Rule about a robe fund laid by by a single non-relative</u>	Niss 8 M
7	<u>Rule about a robe fund laid by by two non-relatives</u>	Niss 9 M
8	<u>Rule about a robe fund given by kings, etc.</u>	Niss 10 M
9	Rule about distributing untimely robe material taken possession of as timely robe material	Niss 2 N
10	Rule about exchanging a robe, and later tearing it away	Niss 3 N
11	<u>Rule about money</u>	Niss 18 M
12	<u>Rule about money transactions</u>	Niss 19 M
13	<u>Rule about buying and selling</u>	Niss 20 M
14	Rule about having asked for one thing asking for another thing	Niss 4 N
15	Rule about having got one thing in exchange, getting another thing in exchange	Niss 5 N
16	First rule about exchanging something belonging to a Sangha	Niss 6 N
17	Second rule about exchanging something belonging to a Sangha	Niss 7 N
18	First rule about exchanging something belonging to a group	Niss 8 N
19	Second rule about exchanging something belonging to a group	Niss 9 N
20	Rule about exchanging something belonging to an individual	Niss 10 N
21	<u>Rule about exchanging a bowl with less than five mends</u>	Niss 22 M
22	<u>Rule about handling medicines</u>	Niss 23 M
23	<u>Rule about having given a robe, taking it away thereafter</u>	Niss 25 M
24	<u>Rule about asking for yarn, having it woven</u>	Niss 26 M
25	<u>Rule about suggesting an alternative for what is woven for oneself</u>	Niss 27 M
26	<u>Rule about special robes</u>	Niss 28 M
27	<u>Rule about apportioning to herself an apportioned possession belonging to a Sangha</u>	Niss 30 M
28	Rule about making a hoard of bowls	Niss 1 N
29	Rule about bargaining for a heavy cloth	Niss 11 N
30	Rule about bargaining for a light cloth	Niss 12 N

Table 8: Arrangement of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules according to Sp (underlined: shared rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*)

We do not have names for the sections (*vagga*) from Sp, since there only the twelve Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules unique to bhikkhunīs are listed without any separation into sections (*vaggas*). In the first decade of rules (corresponding to the first *vagga*), robe rules are set forth. The entire section starts with the most important robe rules for bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs, namely the rule concerning the fact that an extra robe may be worn for at most

ten days (Niss 1 M), that one may not live apart from one's robe even for one night (Niss 2 M), and how one has to deal with robe material given outside the robe-giving month (Niss 2 M). The remaining seven rules also deal with robes, namely asking for, accepting, distributing, and exchanging robes, and dealing with robe funds. Thus the first *vagga* focuses exclusively on robes. The second section starts with the similarly important rules on handling money (Niss 18 M), carrying out monetary transactions (Niss 19 M), and buying and selling (Niss 20 M). These are central rules again for both communities. The remainder is filled with rules unique to bhikkhunīs concerning the asking for, and exchanging of objects having different owners (Niss 4–10 N), which go well with the first three rules concerning monetary transactions. The third section then contains the remaining rules, including both rules on bowls (Niss 22 M and Niss 1 N), the handling of medicine (Niss 23 M), rules concerning woven material (Niss 25 M, 26 M), and the rule about apportioning an otherwise apportioned object (Niss 30 M). From the point of view of content this seems a reasonable arrangement, superior to the arrangement of Kkh. Table 9 shows the difference in the arrangement of the rules.

Distribution of Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules in the complete <i>Bhikkhunīpātimokkha</i> according to Kkh and Sp		
BhnīPāt	Kkh	Sp
1. vagga		
Niss 1–10	Niss 1–10 N	Niss 1–3, 6–10 M
		Niss 2–3 N
2. vagga		
Niss 11–20	Niss 11–12 N	Niss 18–20 M
	Niss 1–3, 6–10 M	Niss 4–10 N
3. vagga		
Niss 21–30	Niss 18–20, 22–23, 25–28, 30 M	Niss 22–23, 25–28, 30 M
		Niss 1, 11, 12 N

Table 9: Arrangements of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules according to Sp and Kkh

3.3.4 Arrangement of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules in the complete *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha* editions

In all complete BhnīPāt editions the arrangement of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules follows the guideline of Kkh, and not that of Sp. Since Kkh is a commentary on the separately transmitted *Pātimokkhas* it is to be assumed that the sequence found in Kkh was the one the author had before him in the *mūla* text.

As stated in the beginning, Sp and Kkh were not written by the same author. This difference regarding the arrangement of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules is further evidence for this. It is, however, surprising that the author of Kkh, who used Sp and explicitly referred to it seventeen times, did not mention this deviating arrangement. Especially since the arrangement suggested in Sp from the viewpoint of content is a more consistent one. The only explanation for that seems to be that Kkh was intended for practical usage, which implies that only the authoritative regulation is given, and deviating versions are not discussed. In

addition, none of the subcommentaries on the *Vinaya* comments on this passage,⁶⁰ neither do the commentaries on the *Kaṅkhāvitaranī*.⁶¹

This divergence is strange, especially seen in light of the fact that the author of Kkh is a very knowledgeable commentator. Another possibility, namely that the guidelines in Kkh stem from some copyist, and crept into the text during its transmission, must be dismissed, since the guidelines for the arrangement, and the numbering of the rules go hand in hand, and since the author also gives a very similar guideline at the end of the Pācittiya section, making it probable that both stem from his hand. Thus we have to assume that at the time of the writing of Kkh the arrangement described in that text was the usual way of arranging the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules in the Theravāda BhnīPāt. This at the same time would imply that the older arrangement described in Sp was no longer prevailing or belonged to a Mahāvihāra branch different from that of Kkh.⁶²

3.3.5 Arrangement of the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya equivalents in other schools' *Bhikṣunī-prātimokṣas*

Comparing the arrangement of the Theravāda Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules with the arrangement of the equivalent rules in the *Bhikṣunīprātimokṣas* of the Dharmaguptaka, Sarvāstivāda, Mahīśāsaka, Mūlasarvāstivāda and Mahāsāṃghika, it becomes evident that all schools begin with the shared rules from the *Bhikṣuprātimokṣa*, except the Theravāda tradition as represented in Kkh and in the complete BhnīPāt editions. Thus, from a comparative point of view the Sp arrangement is closer to that of the other schools, whereas the Kkh tradition looks suspiciously like being a secondary arrangement. All schools except the *Kaṅkhāvitaranī*-Theravāda, the *Samantapāsādikā*-Theravāda, and the Mahāsāṃghika tradition position the rules unique to bhikṣuṇīs second, that is, after the shared rules. Thus the rules are given in two blocks. Although the *Kaṅkhāvitaranī*-Theravāda tradition gives these two groups of rules in two blocks too, it has exactly the opposite sequence. The *Samantapāsādikā*-Theravāda and the Mahāsāṃghika tradition are conspicuous because they insert rules unique to bhikkhunīs within the shared rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*. The *Samantapāsādikā*-Theravāda tradition, as shown above (3.3.3), intersperses Niss 2 and 3 unique to bhikkhunīs between the shared rules Niss 10 M and Niss 18 M, Niss 4 to 10 unique to bhikkhunīs between the shared rules Niss 20 M and Niss 22 M, and then adds Niss 1, 11, 12 unique to bhikkhunīs at the end after the shared rule Niss 30 M. The Mahāsāṃghikas present ten shared rules in the beginning (Niss 1–3, 18–19, 6–10 M) and the end (Niss 21–30 M), placing ten rules unique to bhikṣuṇīs in the middle.⁶³ From the remaining schools the Dharmaguptakas and Sarvāstivādas are especially close. Except for the sequence of Niss 16

⁶⁰ Vjb 366,2 ends with the commentary on the eleventh rule unique to bhikkhunīs, Sp-ṭ III 122,19 with the twelfth, and Vmv II 75,19 with the eighth. None comments on the passage dealing with the arrangement.

⁶¹ The old subcommentary on Kkh comments upon the entire Nissaggiya-Pācittiya section of the *Bhikkhunī-pātimokkha* in a mere eight lines including heading and subheading (Kkh-ṭ 113,1–8). The new commentary ends with the commentary on the twelfth rule (Kkh-nṭ 466,1–4).

⁶² In connection with the Kkh also represents a younger stage, and there too the author does not discuss the older structure as handed down in Sp (Kieffer-Püllz 2012, 21).

⁶³ Since the rules unique to bhikṣuṇīs in this tradition deviate from those of the other schools in wording it is not possible in an overview as the present one to see which of the unshared bhikṣuṇī rules match the rules of the other schools. Furthermore, their Niss 18 in the complete *Bhikṣunīprātimokṣa* corresponds to Pac 77 N in the complete BhnīPāt of the Theravādins.

to 17 M they completely agree with each other. The Mahīśāsaka tradition deviates from the other schools in that after the tenth NP it gives the shared rules in a deviating sequence (26, 27, 25, 29, 26, 28, 22, 20, 19, 18). The Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition has thirty-three rules instead of thirty. It is peculiar in that it inserts two rules unique to monks in the other traditions, obviously taking them as being shared by bhikṣuṇīs.⁶⁴ Despite these differences it is noticeable that the *Samantapāsādikā*-Theravāda tradition, the Dharmaguptaka, and Sarvāstivāda traditions end the entire Nissaggiya-Pācittiya-Section with the two rules unique to bhikkhunīs concerning bargaining of heavy and light cloths (Niss 29–30). This also holds true for the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition where two similar rules stand at the end, namely possessing heavy and light clothes (Niss 32–33). Only the Mahīśāsakas and Mahāsāṃghikas seemingly deviate. The Mahīśāsakas transmit these rules as NP 23 and 24, adding several other rules unique to bhikṣuṇīs. The Mahāsāṃghikas, however, like the other schools also list them as the last of the rules unique to bhikṣuṇīs. But since these rules are transmitted as rules eleven to twenty in this school's *Prātimokṣa*, they are numbered as NP 19 and 20. Thus all in all it is to be assumed that in the original sequence the first ten shared Nissaggiya rules stood at the beginning, and the whole section ended with the rules concerning a heavy and a light cloth unique to bhikkhunīs. From this point of view, the arrangement in Kkh and the present day complete BhnīPāts seems to be secondary too.

3.4 Arrangement of the Pācittiya rules in the *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha*

3.4.1 Arrangement of the Pācittiya rules in the *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha* according to *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* and *Samantapāsādikā*

Kkh and Sp both contain guidelines as to the sequence of the rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* shared with bhikkhunīs and the unshared rules in the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*. Though they differ in wording, they agree regarding the rules to be inserted in the complete Bhnīpāt as well as with respect to the sequence. The rules from the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* unique to bhikkhunīs are simply followed by the rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* common to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs. Kkh states:

“With respect to the seven sections from here on, beginning with the section about lying, the analysis is to be understood in exactly the way stated in the commentary on the *Bhikkhupātimokkha*.

The sixteenth section.

Recited, Noble ladies, are the one hundred and sixty-six rules entailing expiation: seventy [rules] common [to bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs] prescribed concerning bhikkhus, ninety-six [rules] unique [to bhikkhunīs], thus [there are] one hundred and sixty-six [rules]. The remainder is absolutely clear everywhere.”⁶⁵

⁶⁴. Niss 4 M washing an old robe of a monk not related to her; Niss 5 M accepting a robe from a monk not related to her.

⁶⁵. Kkh 366,20–367,2: *ito paresu musāvādavaggādīsu sattasu vaggesu Bhikkhupātimokkhavaṇṇanāyam vuttanayen’ eva vinicchayo veditabbo ti.*

solasamavaggo.

udditthā kho ayyāyo chasatthisatā pācittiya dhammā ti (Pāt 222,19) *bhikkhū ārabba paññattā sādhāraṇā sattati, asādhāraṇā channavutti evam chasatthisatā. sesam sabbattha uttānam eva ti.*

Sp in addition to what we have in Kkh contains a detailed account of which [Suddha-] Pācittiya rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* are not valid for nuns. Regarding the sequence in which the rules are positioned the author simply enumerates first the rules from the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*, then those from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*.

“Recited, Noble ladies, are the one hundred and sixty six rules entailing expiation: here all the rules [together] are one hundred and eighty-eight rules, [i.e.] ninety-six small [rules] for nuns, ninety-two for monks. Removing from them (i.e. the latter) the following twenty-two rules: the entire Nuns‘ section (Pāc 21–30 M), [the rules about] a meal in succession (Pāc 33 M), a meal consisting in food that is not left over⁶⁶ (Pāc 35 M), an invitation to bring food not left over⁶⁷ (Pāc 36 M), asking for fine foods (Pāc 39 M), the rule about naked recluses (Pāc 41 M), [the rules] concealing gross offences (Pāc 64 M), ordination of one under twenty years (Pāc 65 M), going the same way together with a woman by arrangement (Pāc 67), entering the royal bedchamber (Pāc 83 M), entering a village at the wrong time without asking leave of a bhikkhu, if one is present (Pāc 85 M), sitting cloth (Pāc 89 M), rains’ cloth (Pāc 91 M); [thus there] remain one hundred and sixty-six rules [which] are recited in accordance with the recitation of the Pātimokkha. [Thus one hundred and sixty-six rules] are to be understood. Therefore, [the author of the Pātimokkha] says: **Recited, Noble ladies, are the one hundred and sixty-six rules entailing expiation ... thus I record it.”**⁶⁸

This arrangement is in agreement with that of Kkh, and the complete BhnīPāt editions.

3.4.2 Arrangement of the [Suddha-]Pācittiya equivalents in other schools’ *Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣas*

As in the Saṅghādisesa and the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya sections the Theravāda tradition deviates from all other schools in that it begins with the rules unique to bhikkhunīs. All other schools start the Pācittiya section with the shared rules from the *Bhikṣuvibhaṅga*.

4. Conclusions

All schools except the Theravāda begin each of the four classes of offences containing rules from both *Vibhaṅgas* (Pārājika, Saṅghādisesa, Nissaggiya-Pācittiya, [Suddha-]Pācittiya) in their *Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣas* with the shared rules from the *Bhikṣuvibhaṅga*. The Theravāda shares this structure only in the first class, that is that of the Pārājika rules. Regarding the Saṅghādisesa, Nissaggiya-Pācittiya, and [Suddha-]Pācittiya sections, the complete Theravāda BhnīPāt editions and the *Pātimokkha* commentary, Kkh, begin with the rules unique to bhikkhunīs from the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*, that is, in the opposite sequence. This also is the case in the *Vinaya* commentary, Sp, with respect to the Saṅghādisesa and [Suddha]Pācittiya

^{66.} *anatirittabhojanam*; In Pāt 58,1 this rule is called *paṭhamapavāraṇa*

^{67.} *anatirittenā abhihaṭṭhū pavāraṇam*. In Pāt 58,5 it is called *dutiyapavāraṇā*.

^{68.} Sp IV 947,18–948,2: *udditthā kho ayyāyo chasatthīsatā* (B^e °tam, C^e E^e °ta) *pācittiyā dhammā ti* (Vin IV 345,24) ettha sabbān’ eva bhikkhunīnam khuddakesu (C^e khuddake, E^e khuddake pi) channavuti (E^e navuti), *bhikkhūnam dvenavutī ti aṭṭhāstisatasikkhāpadāni* (B^e °satañ sikkhā°). tato sakalañ bhikkhunīvaggam, paramparabhojanam, *anatirittabhojanam*, *anatirittenā abhihaṭṭhū pavāraṇam*, *pañtabhojanavīññatti*, acelakasikkhāpadāni, duṭṭhullapāticchādanam, ṫnavīsativassūpasampādanam, mātugāmena saddhiñ sam-vidhāya addhānagamanam, rājantepuraappavesanam, santam bhikkhuñ anāpucchā vikāle gāmapavesanam, nisīdanam vassikasātikan ti imāni dvāvīsati sikkhāpadāni apanetvā sesāni satañ ca chasatthi ca sikkhāpadāni pātimokkhuddesamaggena *udditthānī hontī ti veditabbāni*. tenāha: *udditthā kho ayyāyo chasatthīsatā* (B^e °tam, C^e E^e °ta) *pācittiyā dhammā ... pe ... evam etam dhārayāmī ti* (Vin IV 345,24–28).

sections. For the Nissaggiya-Pācittiya section, however, Sp offers a deviating arrangement starting like all other schools with the shared rules from the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga*. The arrangement of Sp is the older one and, from the point of view of content, the more consistent. It, however, stands in contradiction to the Theravāda tradition as represented by Kkh, its commentaries and the complete BhnīPāt editions. Possible explanations are that the arrangement given in Sp stems from some older source, and was no longer in use at the time of the origination of Kkh, or, alternative, that Sp and Kkh represent different sub-branches of the Mahāvihāra. That the knowledgeable author of Kkh, who demonstrably uses Sp, does not discuss the deviating sequence, most probably is intentional, since we can observe a similar attitude of his in another instance (see above n. 62). As an author of a short and comprehensive commentary intended for the daily practice of bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs he transmits the relevant and authoritative statements only, and unlike Sp, in general neither gives nor discusses different opinions. This would be sufficient reason not to comment on the deviating arrangement of Sp. An alternative interpretation, namely that the guideline in Kkh was added in the course of the transmission of the commentary by some copyist, can be safely dismissed since, firstly, the arrangement expressed in the guideline is corroborated by the numbering of the rules within the text of Kkh; secondly, a similar guideline is provided in Kkh for the Pācittiya section; and, thirdly, comparable guidelines exist for the Saṅghādisesa section. Thus it can be safely assumed that the Kkh arrangement was the one and only valid arrangement at the time of Kkh's origination. The difference between these two commentaries hints at a break or development within the Theravāda Mahāvihāra. Whether this results from a regional or chronological difference or from an attribution of Kkh to a Mahāvihāra branch different from that represented by Sp, or whether the arrangement in Sp is a remnant from some earlier tradition, still closer to the other Buddhist schools in India, remains unsolved.

Acknowledgements

This article formed part of a lecture given at the UK Association of Buddhist Studies Conference 2015: "Monastic Community and Society: Buddhist Precepts and Communal Law". I want to express my sincere thanks to Dhammadinnā Bhikkhunī (Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts, Taipei) for her suggestions and corrections, and to Shayne Clarke (McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada) for correcting and improving my English. It goes without saying that all faults are my own responsibility.

Abbreviations

BD	<i>The Book of the Discipline</i> , transl. I. B. Horner, London: Oxford University Press, 1938–1966.
B ^e	Burmese edition
BhnīPāt	<i>Bhikkhūnīpātimokkha</i>
BhPāt	<i>Bhikkhupātimokkha</i>
BudSir	Buddhist Scriptures Information Retrieval, Mahidol University, Bangkok.
c.	century
C ^e	Ceylonese edition
CSCD	Chatthaśaṅgāyana CD-ROM, Version 3.0 (Igatpuri: Vipassana Research Institute, 1999)
Dh	Dharmaguptaka
FPL	Fragile Palm Leaves, Bangkok
Horner	see BD
Kkh	<i>Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī, Pātimokkhāṭṭhakathā</i> [if not specified Kkh refers to E ^e].
B ^e	Burmese edition, CSCD.
C ^e	Ceylonese edition, in the notes of Kkh E ^e .
E ^e	<i>Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī by Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa</i> , ed. K. R. Norman, William Pruitt, Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2003.

Kkh-pt	<i>Kaṅkha-vitaraṇī-purāṇaṭīkā</i> , Rangoon: Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition, 1961, 1–117.
Kkh-nt	Buddhanāga, <i>Vinayatthamañjūsā nāma Kaṅkha-vitaraṇī-abhinava-ṭīkā</i> . Rangoon: Chaṭṭha-saṅgāyana edition, 1961, 118–489.
Kkh sinh.	<i>Kaṅkha-vitaraṇī nam Prātimokṣavarṇanāva (siṁhala parivartanaya)</i> , transl. Ācārya Kapila Abhayavamīśa, 2 nd ed., Dehivala, 2009 (original 1998) (Pāli Aṭṭhakathā Siṁhala parivartana, 1).
M	monks (in connection with the Pātimokkha rules)
Mahās	Mahāsāmghika
Mahīś	Mahīśāsaka
Moh	<i>Mohavicchedanī, Abhidhammātikatthavaṇṇanā by Kassapatthera of Cola</i> , ed. A. P. Buddhadatta, A. K. Warder, London: Pali Text Society, 1961.
ms.	manuscript
Mūlasarv	Mūlasarvāstivāda
N	nuns (in connection with the Pātimokkha rules)
N ^e	Nāgarī edition
NP	Naiḥsargika-Pātayantika rules
Niss	Nissaggiya-Pācittiya rules
p	<i>pathamāpatti</i> (category of Sgh rules)
Pāc	[Suddha-]Pācittiya rules
Pār	Pārājika rules
Pāt	<i>The Pātimokkha</i> , ed. and transl. K. R. Norman, William Pruitt, Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2001.
Sarv	Sarvāstivāda
S ^e	Siamese edition
Sgh	Saṅghādisesa rules
Sp	<i>Samantapāsādikā, Vinayaṭṭhakathā</i> [if not specified Sp refers to E ^e].
B ^e	Burmese edition, CSCD.
C ^e	<i>Samantapāsādikā nāma Vinayaṭṭhakathā</i> , 4 parts; pt. 1 ed. Baddegama Piyaratana Thera, Vālivītiye Paṇḍita Sorata Thera; pt. 2 Vālivītiye Pemaratanatthera, Sirimatā Baddegama Piyaratana Mahāthera, Paṇḍita Sorata Thera; pt. 3–4 Vālivītiye Pemaratanatthera, Paṇḍita Sorata Thera; Colombo: Bauddha saṃskṛtika madhyasthānayē aṭṭhakathā vyāprtiye prakāśanaya, 2555/2012.
E ^e	<i>Samantapāsādikā, Vinayaṭṭhakathā</i> , 7 vols., ed. J. Takakusu, M. Nagai (and K. Mizuno in vols. 5 and 7). London: Pali Text Society, 1924–1947.
N ^e	[Nālandā Edition] <i>Samantapāsādikā nāma Aṭṭhakathā</i> , 3 parts, ed. Nathmal Tatiya, Birbal Sharma, and others. Patna: Nava Nālandā-Mahāvihāra, 1964, 1965, 1967.
S ^e	BudSir.
Sp-ṭ	Sāriputta [of Poḷonnaruva], <i>Sāratthadīpanī-ṭīkā</i> , 3 vols., Rangoon: Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition, 1960.
Th	Theravāda
Vin	<i>The Vinaya Piṭakam</i> , ed. Hermann Oldenberg, London: Williams & Norgate, 1879–1883.
Vjb	<i>Vajirabuddhitherena katā Vajirabuddhifīkā</i> , Rangoon: Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition 1960.
Vmv	Coliya Kassapa, <i>Vimativinodanī-ṭīkā</i> , 2 vols., Rangoon: Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition, 1960.
y	<i>yāvatatiyaka</i> (category of Sgh rules)

Bibliography

Anālayo 2014 = Anālayo, *The Dawn of Abhidharma*, Hamburg University Press, 2014 (Hamburg Buddhist Studies, 2).

Clarke 2012 = Shayne Clarke, “Multiple Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticisms: On the Affiliation of the Tibetan Nuns’ Lineages and Beyond,” *Oslo Buddhist Studies Forum*, June 12 [Unprinted article].

----- 2014 = Shayne Clarke, *Family Matters in Indian Buddhist Monasticism*, Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

----- 2015 = Shayne Clarke, “Vinayas,” *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, ed. Jonathan A. Silk and others, Leiden: Brill, 60–87.

Fiordalis 2014 = David Fiordalis, “On Buddhism, Divination and the Worldly Arts: Textual Evidence from the Theravāda Tradition,” *The Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies* 15, 79–108.

von Hinüber 1992 = Oskar von Hinüber, “The arising of an offence: *āpattisamuṭṭhāna*. A note on the structure and history of the Theravāda-Vinaya,” *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 16, 55–69 [Reprinted: von Hinüber, *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 2009, 144–158].

----- 1995a = Oskar von Hinüber, “Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya. A Survey of Theory and Practice,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 18/1, 7–45 [Reprinted: von Hinüber, *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 2009, 174–187].

----- 1995b = Oskar von Hinüber, "The Nigamanas of the Sumanagalavilāsinī and Kañkhāvitaraṇī," *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 21, 129–133.

----- 1996 = Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, vol. 2).

Hüsken 1997 = Ute Hüsken, *Die Vorschriften für die buddhistische Nonnengemeinde im Vinaya-Piṭaka der Theravādin*, Berlin: Reimer Verlag (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, Bd. 11).

Kabilsingh 1991 = Chatsumarn Kabilsingh, *The Bhikkhūnī Pātimokkha of the Six Schools*, translated into English, Bangkok: Thammasat University Press.

Kieffer-Pülz 2012 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, "The Law of Theft: Regulations in the Theravāda Vinaya and the Law Commentaries," *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 31, 1–56.

----- 2013 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, *Verlorene Gaṇṭhipadas zum buddhistischen Ordensrecht. Untersuchungen zu den in der Vajirabuddhiṭikā zitierten Kommentaren Dhammasiris und Vajirabuddhis*, 3 Vols., Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag (Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission, 1).

----- 2015 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, "Vinaya Commentarial Literature in Pāli," *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Vol. I, ed. Jonathan A. Silk and others, Leiden: Brill, 430–441.

----- forthcoming = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, "Reuse of text in Pāli legal commentaries," *Buddhist Studies Review*.

Kieffer-Pülz & Peters 2009 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz & Anne Peters, "Die Pātimokkhapadattha-anuvaṇṇanā des Vicittālaṅkāra aus Ca-laṅh," *Pāsādikadānam. Festschrift für Bhikkhu Pāsādika*, ed. M. Straube and others, Marburg: Indica et Tibetica (Indica et Tibetica, 52), 275–292.

Norman & Pruitt 2001 see Pāt.

Schopen 1997 = Gregory Schopen, "If You Can't Remember, How to Make It Up: Some Monastic Rules for Redacting Canonical Texts," *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ. Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. P. Kieffer-Pülz, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica (Indica et Tibetica, 30), 571–582.

Skilling 1993 = Peter Skilling, "A Note on the History of the Bhikkhunī-saṅgha (II): The Order of Nuns after the Parinirvāṇa," *Pāli & Sanskrit Studies. Mahāmakut Centenary Commemorative Volume and Felicitation Volume to H. H. The Supreme Patriarch (Somdet Phra ṇāṇasāṇvara) on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday*, ed. P. Bodhiprasiddhinand, [Bangkok]: Mahāmakuṭa Rājavidyālaya Foundation, 2536, 208–251.

Sujato 2009 = Bhikkhu Sujato, *Bhikkhuni Vinaya Studies. Research and reflections on monastic discipline for Buddhist nuns*, Australia: Santipada publications.

Vadekar 1939 = Ranganath D. Vadekar, *Pātimokkha: Pāli text in Devanāgarī characters containing the Bhikkhupātimokkha and Bhikkhūnī-pātimokkha*, Poona (Bhandarkar Oriental Series, 1).

Wijayaratna 1991 = Mōhan Wijayaratna, *Les moniales bouddhistes: naissance et développement du monachisme féminin*, Paris: Éd. du Cerf.

----- 2001 = Mōhan Wijayaratna, *Buddhist Nuns. The Birth and Development of a Women's Monastic Order*, Colombo: Wisdom.

----- 2010 = Mōhan Wijayaratna, *Buddhist Nuns. The Birth and Development of a Women's Monastic Order*, revised BPS edition, Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.